



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JGJR.: 06-06

Paper No: ____

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
ATTN: PATENT GROUP
THE BOWEN BUILDING
875 15TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 800
WASHINGTON DC 20005-2221

COPY MAILED
JUN 19 2006
OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Chong, et al.
Application No. 09/736,275
Filed: 15 December, 2000
Attorney Docket No. P1304USA

:
:
:
:
:

ON PETITION

This is a decision on a petition filed on 26 April, 2006, under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

For the reasons set forth below, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

NOTE:

Petitioner must note that the Notice of Change of Address (setting forth a Reston, Virginia, address) filed concurrently with the instant petition and averred to be consistent with Customer No. 022903 is—as of this writing—reflective of the address set forth above, and not the Reston, Virginia, address averred. A copy of this decision is being sent to the Reston, Virginia, address as a courtesy—however, no changes will be made until the proper papers are filed with the Office (e.g., to modify the address correlated to the customer number) and Petitioner must act immediately to resolve this inconsistency in Office records.

BACKGROUND

The record indicates:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the Restriction Requirement mailed on 25 February, 2005, with reply due absent extension of time on or before 25 March, 2005;
- the instant application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 25 March, 2005;
- it does not appear that the Office mailed a Notice of Abandonment before the instant petition was filed;
- Petitioner filed the instant petition on 26 April, 2006, with fee, and, *inter alia*, reply in the form of an election, and made the statement of unintentional delay—thus, Petitioner appears to have satisfied the regulatory requirements under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).¹

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.²

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.³ Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).⁴

¹ 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

² Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

³ See: Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

⁴ See: In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.⁵ Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.⁶))

Allegations as to
Unintentional Delay

The requirements for relief under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are: petition, fee, reply, showing of unintentional delay, and—where appropriate—a terminal disclaimer and fee

It appears that Petitioner has satisfied the requirements of the regulation.

CONCLUSION

Because Petitioner appears to have satisfied the regulatory requirements, regulation, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **granted**.

The application is released to the Examiner in Technology Center 2600 for further processing in due course.

⁵ See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office *supra*.

⁶ Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Gillon', with a stylized, cursive flourish at the end.

John J. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

cc:

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
One Freedom Square
Reston Town Center
11952 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190-5656